

A Universe Form Nothing Lawrence Krauss

The subtitle of the book is "Why There is Something Rather than Nothing". It was not real clear what Krauss was trying to get at. Was Krauss trying to show that the total mass-energy of the universe is zero? Is there enough negative potential energy to cancel the positive mass-energy resulting in zero and is that a legitimate thing to do? Is that what Krauss was trying to get at? And if it is the case that the sum total of the universe is nothing, can we assume that this proves there is no need for a creator. The book was muddled by Krauss' primary purpose of preaching his religion, which is atheism. He failed to show from physical reality that a creator is not necessary. He did show using metaphysical facts that the universe is not in need of a creator. This is conclusive for a large segment of the highly educated scientific community, so the rest of us should go along. The only minor problem is "metaphysical facts" is an oxymoron. But that should not distract anyone, particularly highly educated anyones, from the conclusion drawn out by Krauss.

Krauss is not alone in engaging in bait and switch in presenting science for the masses. It is a problem for all of us who peruse the science section of the bookstores for the few gems that might be there. Many of the books there should be in the bookstore's religious section. I try to be careful but was careless with Krauss' book. On the bottom of the cover is "Afterword by Richard Dawkins". Why would a book on the universe have an afterword by a religious preacher? Christian authors writing about the universe from the point of view of their religion tell the reader up front who they are. Atheist authors do not tell the reader at all but slip in their religion slowly becoming more bold about 2/3 way through the book. It is always the same. As with Krauss, other such author's blur physics in with metaphysics until metaphysics is the rock the author wants us to believe we are standing on. I did not buy the book for religion, metaphysics or mysticism. I was snookered.

While I am at it, what is this theory of everything that keeps popping up in these books? Do I assume it is the holy grail of understanding the universe and all the physical laws in it? Feynman said that if we understand the double slit experiment then we understand all of quantum mechanics. He was saying that man does not have any understanding of the basis of quantum mechanics. The mathematics of the double slit experiment can be understood in an advanced high school physics class. Is this theory of everything going to give an understanding of the principle behind the math of the double slit experiment? Is it going to tell how fifty or so elements can form into life or how that life can have consciousness? Actually, there is more a belief that something called quantum gravity is going to explain consciousness than it is going to explain life. Is consciousness simpler than life? Man may be a pitiful creature knowing a little and thinking he knows a lot. I think it can be determined by now that science and technology are not man's saviors or going to bring man happiness. For much of advanced civilization, the world is condensed to the 4x6 inch portal stuck in front of their face. Is this advancement toward a happier life.

